DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 323 188 SP 032 572

AUTHOR Olsen, Dwayne G.; Heyse, Kathy L.
TITLE Development and Concerns of First-year and Reentry Teachers with and without Mentors.
PUB DATE 20 Apr 90
NOTE 24p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Boston, MA, April 17-20, 1990).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Attitude Change; *Beginning Teacher Induction; *Beginning Teachers; Elementary Secondary Education; *Mentors; *Professional Development; *Reentry Workers; Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Characteristics; *Teacher Effectiveness
IDENTIFIERS *Teacher Concerns Theory (Fuller)

ABSTRACT

This study sought to determine if the Fuller Teacher Concerns Theory explains the development of first-year teachers with and without mentors and of reentry teachers with and without mentors. The Fuller Theory identified three stages of concern as teachers develop professionally: self-survival, teaching tasks, and impact on students. Data were gathered in three semistructured interviews with four groups of teachers categorized as beginning teachers with and without mentors and reentry teachers with and without mentors. Interviews were conducted in October 1986, and February and May 1987. Data indicated changes in concerns in the four groups of teachers over the school year. Although all four groups initially identified considerable concern about discipline, this concern declined during the year. First-year teachers with mentors showed a decline in concern for self and task and an increase in impact concerns over the first year. Those without mentors also showed decrease in self concerns and increase in impact concerns, but remained at the same level for task concerns throughout the year. Reentry teachers with mentors showed limited development; reentry teachers without mentors made the greatest progress through the stages of the Fuller Teacher Concerns Theory. Questions are raised on how closely mentor teachers should work with mentees and when that support should be withdrawn. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED323188

Development and Concerns of First-year and Reentry Teachers With and Without Mentors

Dwayne G. Olsen
University of Wisconsin-Parkside
Kenosha, WI 53141-2000

Kathy L. Heyse
Racine Unified School District
Racine, WI 53404

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

D. G. Olsen

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

A paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Boston, April 20, 1990

SP032572

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Introduction, Objectives and Theoretical Framework

Introduction and Objectives. In response to the many reports on education in the 1980's, "[o]ne widely agreed upon improvement is the development of teacher induction programs at both local and statewide levels." (Odell, 1987, p. 69; also see Hall, 1982). As a result, monitoring of teachers' early work in the classroom is regarded as important in developing teaching skills which, in turn, ". . . increases the likelihood that a teacher will develop a productive, professionally satisfying style. . . ." (Moffett, St. John and Isken, 1987, p. 34) and thus remain in teaching.

Specifically, the goals of this study were to determine: 1) Whether Fuller's Teacher Concerns Theory explained the development of first-year teachers with mentors (denoted in the narrative and tables as "1st-year/mentors") and first-year teachers without mentors (1st-year/no mentors); 2) Whether Fuller's Teacher Concerns Theory explained the development of reentry teachers with mentors (reentry/mentors) and reentry teachers without mentors (reentry/no mentors); and 3) To what extent discipline was a concern for the first-year and reentry teachers of this study.

Theoretical Framework. Several theories impinge upon induction of teachers (Feiman-Nemser and Floden, 1985 For the purposes of this study, the Fuller Teacher Concerns Theory (Fuller, 1969; Fuller and Bown, 1975; George, 1978) was selected as the theoretical base. According to this theory, teachers progress through three stages of concern as they develop professionally:

> a survival stage when teachers are preoccupied with their own adequacy, a mastery stage when teachers concentrate on performance and concerns focus on the teaching task, and an impact stage when teachers become concerned about their effects on pupils. (Feiman-Nemser & Floden, 1985, 522)

These stages address what the teacher is concerned about rather than teacher

accomplishments (Fuller and Bown, 1975) and, theoretically, are developmentally related (George, 1978). "Only after both self concerns and task concerns have been dealt with successfully do concerns about impact begin to predominate." (George, 1978, p. 1)

Methods and Data Source

Methods. This study was a longitudinal panel study (Borg & Gall, 1983) in which data were gathered in three semistructured interviews in October 1986, and February and May 1987. Since the panel study uses the same subjects at each data collection point, ". . . changes [can be noted] in specific individuals [and exploration of] . . . possible reasons why these individuals have changed." (p. 412) In order to identify the major concern(s) of teachers at the time of the interview in light of the Fuller Theory, the questions asked in each interview were: Interview 1, "What has been your greatest problem or concern so far this year?"; and, Interviews 2 and 3, "What is your greatest concern/problem(s) right now?" Descriptive statistics, specifically frequencies and breakdowns, were used to analyze the data.

Responses to the questions were categorized independently by each researcher using a protocol based on George's (1978) interpretation of the Fuller Theory. Discrepancies were resolved for responses on which the researchers disagreed. Concerns about "self" included issues such as wanting to be liked by students and fellow teachers, wanting positive evaluations from supervisors, and issues related to discipline techniques and class control. "Task" concerns included issues such as too many students, too few materials, and knowing the lesson while "impact" concerns related to helping students with their learning and challenging less motivated students. (George, 1978)

Data Source. Subjects were four groups of volunteer teachers in two urban and nine rural school districts in southeastern Wisconsin. Twenty teachers, fourteen first-year teachers (1st-year/mentors) and six reentry teachers

(reentry/mentors), were assigned mentors. Another nineteen teachers without assigned mentors were in two comparison groups. Eight first-year teachers formed the "1st-year/no mentors" group and eleven reentry teachers without assigned mentors formed the "reentry/no mentors" group. In addition to assigned mentors, teachers with mentors were given release time.

Further demographic information is presented in Table 1 on the gender, grade level, and subject taught in the case of special education teachers, for teachers in this study. In terms of previous experience for reentry teachers, five of six reentry teachers with mentors had 1-5 years and one had 6-10 years. For reentry teachers without mentors, seven had 1-5 years of previous experience, one had 6-10 years, two had over 10 years, and one had an unknown number of years of previous experience.

[Insert Table 1 Here]

Seven interviewers (the two researchers and five additional educators who had participated in developing the interview protocols of the study), collected the data in three interviews during the 1986-1987 school year. Interviews took place in October 1986 and February and May 1987.

Limitations

Several limitations must be indicated. First, the subjects in this study were volunteers. Several subjects who were asked to work with a mentor declined but agreed to serve as members of a comparison group. To what extent their declining to work with a mentor affected their responses is unknown. The results of this study may also be distorted by the fact that some of the first-year and reentry teachers without mentors were involved in "informal" mentor relationships for a portion of the school year--these relationships were, to a greater or lesser extent, similar to those of mentor relationships. Another limitation is that the questions about teacher concerns were worded somewhat differently in each interview. Finally, the issue or concern expressed in each interview was

assumed to be the major concern of that teacher, and thus an indicator of the level of concern at that time. When multiple responses were given to the interview question, the first response was assumed to be the level of concern for that teacher. In addition, two subjects did not respond with specific concerns; those are noted in the data of Tables 2-7.

Findings

Tables 2, 3, and 4 (below) present the results of the three interviews for the four groups of teachers in this study. Specifically, the responses of first-year teachers with mentors (1st-year/mentors), reentry teachers with mentors (reentry/mentors), first-year teachers without mentors (1st-year/no mentors) and reentry teachers without mentors (reentry/no mentors) are summarized for the first interview in Table 2. Data from the second and third interviews for these four groups are summarized in Tables 3 and 4 respectively. In addition, discipline as a concern is examined separately in Table 8.

First Interview. In the first interview, subjects were asked "What has been your greatest problem or concern so far this year?" The data, summarized in Table 2, indicate that seven (50%) of the fourteen first-year teachers with mentors expressed "self" concerns, six (43%) expressed "task" concerns, and one (7%) expressed an "impact" concern in response to that question. Also at this time, four (67%) of the six reentry teachers with mentors expressed "self" concerns, one (17%) expressed a "task" concern, and one (17%) did not respond to the question.

[Insert Table 2 Here]

In this first interview, four (50%) of the eight first-year teachers without mentors expressed "self" concerns and four (50%) expressed "task" concerns. For the eleven reentry teachers without mentors, five (45%) identified "self" concerns, four (36%) identified "task" concerns, and two (18%) indicated "impact" concerns.

Second Interview. In the second interview, subjects were asked, "What is your greatest concern/problem(s) right now?" Data from that interview are presented in Table 3. Six (43%) of the fourteen first-year teachers with mentors expressed "self" concerns, five (36%) expressed "task" concerns, and three (21%) expressed "impact" concerns. Of the six reentry teachers with mentors in this second interview, three (50%) expressed "self" concerns, one (17%) expressed a "task" concern, and two (33%) expressed "impact" concerns.

[Insert Table 3 Here]

In this second interview, none of the eight first-year teachers without mentors expressed "self" concerns, five (63%) stated "task" concerns, and three (38%) indicated "impact" concerns. Of the eleven reentry teachers without mentors, two (18%) stated "self" concerns, six (55%) indicated "task" concerns, and three (36%) indicated "impact" concerns.

Third Interview. The final interview of this study asked, "What are your greatest concerns right now?" These data, summarized in Table 4, indicate that five (36%) of the first-year teachers with mentors were concerned about "self" while four (29%) were concerned about "task" issues, four (29%) were concerned about "impact," and one (7%) gave no response. Three (50%) of the six first-year teachers with mentors were concerned about "self," and one each (17%) was concerned about a "task" issue, an "impact" issue, or gave no response.

[Insert Table 4 Here]

In this third interview, two (25%) of the eight first-year teachers without mentors indicated "self" concerns, four (50%) indicated "task" concerns, and two (25%) indicated "impact" concerns (see Table 4). For reentry teachers without mentors, data from the third interview indicated that two teachers (18%) were concerned about "self" issues, three (27%) were concerned about "task" issues, and six (55%) were concerned about "impact" issues.

Comparison of Teachers Over Three Interviews. In an effort to summarize and

analyze the development of concerns identified by the teachers of this study, the data from the three interviews with first-year teachers with mentors are compared to the data from first-year teachers without mentors in Table 5. Data across the three interviews of reentry teachers with and without mentors are compared in Table 6.

The data of Table 5 indicate that for the fourteen first-year teachers with mentors there was a decline in "self" concerns from interview one to interview three--from 50% in interview one to 43% in interview two and 36% in interview three. "Task" concerns showed a similar decline for these first-year teachers with mentors--from 43% to 36% to 29%--while "impact" concerns increased from 7% to 21% to 29%. One first-year teacher with a mentor did not respond to the question in interview three.

[Insert Table 5 Here]

For the eight first-year teachers without mentors, the data of Table 5 indicate a decline in "self" concerns from 50% in interview one, to 0% in interview two, and 25% in interview three. For these teachers, "task" concerns began at 50% in interview one, rose to 63% in interview two, and concluded at 50% in interview three while "impact" issues were first apparent at 38% in interview two and concluded at 25% in interview three.

[Insert Table 6 Here]

Table 6 summarizes the data of the three interviews for the reentry teachers with and without mentors. For the six reentry teachers with mentors, 67% expressed "self" concerns in interview one while 50% indicated "self" concerns in interviews two and three. "Task" concerns remained at 17% for all three interviews of the reentry teachers with mentors while "impact" concerns began at 33% in the second interview and ended at 17% in the third interview. One teacher did not respond in interview one and indicated no concerns in interview three.

For the eleven reentry teachers without mentors, 45% indicated "self"

concerns in the first interview and 18% each in interviews two and three. "Task" concerns for this group began at 36% in the first interview, went to 55% in the second interview, and settled at 27% in the third interview while "impact" concerns began at 18% in the first interview, moved to 27%, and finalized at 55% in the third interview.

Concern Patterns. To further analyze the data of this study, the results are presented in terms of patterns of development across the three interviews for teachers in the four groups (see Table 7). Part A of Table 7 presents the concern patterns of first-year and reentry teachers with and without mentors (by the four groups) who indicated "self" concerns in the first interview. Table 7, Part B presents the concern patterns for teachers demonstrating "task" concerns in the first interview while Part C presents the concern patterns for the two teachers with demonstrated "impact" concerns in the first interview.

[Insert Table 7 Here]

Concern Patterns of First-Year Teachers With Mentors. Of the seven first-year teachers with mentors who identified a "self" issue in interview one, three (21%) identified a "self" issue (the lowest level of the Fuller Theory) as the major concern in each of the three interviews, i.e., provided an "S S S" concern pattern in Column 1 of Table 7. The remaining four (29%) first-year teachers with mentors who identified a "self" issue in the first interview provided a variety of concern patterns as indicated in Table 7, e.g., "S T T" ("self," "task," "task"); "S I T" ("self," "impact," "task"). Two first-year teachers with mentors, identified "S S I" and "S I I" concern patterns in Table 7; these teachers identified "self" level of concerns in the first interview and "impact" level concerns in the third interview, "impact" being the highest level in the Fuller Theory.

The response of one first-year teacher with a mentor (7%) remained "task" oriented (the middle level of the Fuller Theory) in all three interviews, a "T T

T" pattern. The response of another first-year teacher with a mentor was "task" oriented in the first two interviews and "self" oriented in the last, a "T T S" pattern, while the responses of another were "task" oriented in the first two interviews and "impact" oriented in the third, a "T T I" pattern. Only one first-year teacher with a mentor expressed an "impact" concern in the first interview, thus providing an "I T I" pattern with an "impact" concern in the final interview. The remaining first-year teachers with mentors indicated a variety of concern patterns.

Concern Patterns of First-Year Teachers Without Mentors. Of the eight first-year teachers without mentors, four teachers stated "self" concerns and four stated "task" concerns in the first interview while none indicated an "impact" concern in the first interview (Table 7). Of these first-year teachers without mentors, two were "task" oriented in all interviews, a "T T T" pattern. The remaining six teachers displayed concern patterns showing progression, and sometimes retreat, through the stages of the theory with two teachers expressing "impact" concerns in the final interview.

Concern Patterns of Reentry Teachers With Mentors. A summary of the data from the first interview of the six reentry teachers with mentors indicates that four teachers expressed a "self" concern, one expressed a "task" concern, and one expressed an "impact" concern in the first interview (Table 7). In the third interview, three reentry teachers with mentors expressed "self" concerns, one expressed a task" concern, and one an "impact" concern. Three of these six reentry teachers with mentors remained "self" oriented in the three interviews, thus indicating a "S S S" pattern. Only one reentry teacher with a mentor expressed an "impact" concern in the final interview while one teacher did not identify a concern.

Concern Patterns of Reentry Teachers Without Mentors. Of the eleven reentry teachers without mentors, five indicated "self" concerns, four had "task"

concerns, and two "impact" concerns in the first interview (Table 7). One teacher held "self" concerns, an "S S S" pattern and two held "task" concerns, a "T T T" pattern in the three interviews. In addition, six of these eleven reentry teachers expressed "impact" concerns in the final interview.

Examples of Concern Patterns. The concern patterns of five teachers are detailed here to indicate the sequence and development of concerns by teachers in this study. A first-year teacher with a mentor, identified with an "S I I" pattern in Table 7, identified "discipline" (a self-oriented issue) as a concern in the first interview, "[students] are getting what they need academically and socially" (impact) in the second interview, and "meeting the needs of students" (impact) in the third interview. A reentry teacher with a mentor, identified with an "S T T" pattern in Table 7 was concerned about "discipline" (self) in the first interview, "time for preparation" (task) in the second, and "finishing the school year" (task) in the final interview.

Perhaps the most interesting pattern presented was the "I I S" pattern of a reentry teacher without a mentor. In the first interview, this teacher was concerned about "lack of [student] motivation and responsibility" (impact) and in the second about "quality of instruction for students" (impact). However, in the third interview, this teacher indicated that she wanted to "be happy" (self). The first-year teacher with a mentor identified as having a "T S ?" pattern in Table 7 was concerned about "setting up bulletin boards" (task) in the first interview, "behavior management" (self) in the second, and indicated "no greatest concern" in the third. Finally, the reentry teacher with a mentor identified as "? I ?" in column 5 gave the following responses to this question: Interviews one and three, no response; and in interview two, "What to do with lower level students" (impact).

Discipline as a Concern. Since discipline/classroom management has been of considerable concern to first-year teachers (Fuller, 1969; Fuller and Bown, 1975;

Cruickshank and Callahan, 1983; Veenman, 1984; Bullough, 1989), that issue was examined specifically in this study (see Table 8). For first-year teachers, six (43%) of the fourteen first-year teachers with mentors reported discipline as their greatest problem at the time of the first interview while three (38%) of the eight first-year teachers without mentors reported discipline as a problem. In the second interview, four (29%) of the first-year teachers with mentors reported discipline as a problem; at the same time, no first-year teacher without a mentor reported discipline as the greatest concern. In the third interview, three (23%) first-year teachers with mentors reported discipline as a concern while discipline was identified as a concern by one (13%) first-year teacher without a mentor.

[Insert Table 8 Here]

Table 8 also indicates that reentry teachers with mentors expressed more concern about discipline than any other group in the first interview. Specifically, three reentry teachers with mentors (60%) expressed concern for discipline in the first interview while only two reentry teachers without mentors (18%) expressed such concern. In the second interview, one reentry teacher with a mentor (17%) reported concern about discipline while no reentry teacher without a mentor (0%) identified discipline as a problem. No reentry teacher with a mentor (0%) reported discipline as a concern in the third interview while one reentry teacher without a mentor (9%) reported discipline as a concern.

Discussion

An examination of the data from the three interviews of this study (Tables 5 and 6) indicates the change in concerns over the school year occurring for the four groups of teachers in this study: first-year with mentors, first-year teachers without mentors, reentry teachers with mentors, and reentry teachers without mentors. Table 5 summarizes interviews with the two groups of first-year teachers. Consistent with the Fuller Theory, first-year teachers with mentors declined in both "self" (from 50% in interview one to 36% in interview three) and "task" concerns (from 43% in interview one to 29% in interview three) and developed more concern for impact during the course of the year (from 7% in interview one to 29% in interview three). First-year teachers without mentors also decreased in concern for "self" (from 50% in interview one to 25% in interview three) but did not decline in concern for "task" issues from the first to the third interviews (50% in both interviews). However, first-year teachers without mentors increased in "impact" concerns over the course of the year--from 0% in the first interview to 25% in the third interview.

These results show the decline of self concerns for first-year teachers with and without mentors and reentry teachers without mentors consistent with Ryan's (1986) view that the survival (self) stage usually lasts for about half of the first year of teaching. However, these results contradict the findings of Butler and Smith's (1989) study of fifth-year interns in an alternative secondary teacher certification program involving mentors and less than a full load of teaching. Using the "Stages of Concern Questionnaire" (SoC), they found "No significant variations . . . for concern levels reflected in weekly problems or stress levels observed at four points in time." (p. 6) Unfortunately Butler and Smith did not explain their findings. Perhaps the limited teaching load affected these teachers' concern levels which might suggest that first-year teachers would

function better with less than a full teaching load.

In Table 6, the summary of interview data from reentry teachers with and without mentors indicates that reentry teachers with mentors decreased slightly in "self" concerns (from 67% in the first interview to 50% in the third), remained the same on "task" concerns over the three interviews (17%), and increased only slightly in "impact" concerns (from 0% to 17%). Reentry teachers without mentors decreased in "self" (from 45% in the first interview to 18% in the third) and "task" concerns (from 36% in the first interview to 27% in the third) and increased in "impact" concerns (from 18% to 55%). It is particularly noteworthy that the reentry teachers without mentors showed the highest level of "impact" concerns in the final interview. This high level of "impact" concerns by reentry teachers without mentors raises the question, "To what extent, if any, does a mentor retard or inhibit development in a first-year or reentry teacher?"

Patterns of Teacher Concerns. Seven patterns of teacher concerns emerged shown by two or more teachers (Table 7). Three first-year teachers with mentors (21%) and three reentry teachers with mentors (50%) had a "S S S" pattern. For first-year teachers without mentors, two (25%) showed a "S T T" pattern, two (25%) showed a "S I S" pattern and two showed a "T T T" pattern. Two reentry teachers without mentors showed a "T T T" pattern and two showed a "S T I" pattern.

The two teachers with the "S T I" pattern were the only subjects who progressed from lowest to highest through the stages postulated by Fuller. In addition to these two teachers with the "S T I" pattern, nine additional teachers showed "impact" concerns in the final interview. As a result, a total of eleven of thirty-nine teachers (28%) in the study showed an "impact" concern in the final interview, the highest level according to the Fuller. The development of the teachers of this study is apparent when one considers that only three teachers (8%) showed "impact" concerns in the first interview. By way of

contrast, a total of twelve teachers (31%) showed "self" concerns in the final interview, down from 20 teachers (51%) in the first interview.

The remaining twelve teachers evidenced patterns which culminated in "task" concerns in the third interview. As is apparent from these data, many of the teachers progressed and retreated through the "self," "task," and "impact" concerns of the Fuller Theory but did not end at the "impact" level. These findings would seem to support Cruickshank and Callahan's (1983) conclusion that

> Most teachers probably reach stage 2 [task]; that is, they survive well enough to give serious attention to their teaching. It seems to us that few attain the last goal [impact]. . . ." (p. 254)

At this point, the question of whether the mentors inhibited the development of their mentees must be raised since seven of nineteen teachers without mentors (37%) reached the "impact" level in the third interview while only four of twenty first-year and reentry teachers with mentors (20%) identified "impact" concerns. This seems to reinforce Fuller and Bown's (1975) conclusion that the research question must be "'What kinds of interventions by what kinds of interveners in what contexts elicit what responses from which subjects?'" (p. 26)

Discipline/Classroom Management. Of the four groups of teachers in this study, reentry teachers without mentors reported the lowest concern for discipline in the first interview (18%) compared to 60% by reentry teachers with mentors, and 43% and 38% respectively by first-year teachers with and without mentors. In the third interview no reentry teacher with a mentor indicated a discipline/classroom management concern while one reentry teacher without a mentor (9%) and three first-year teachers with mentors (23%) and one first-year teacher without a mentor (13%) demonstrated such concerns. The fact that approximately 80% or more of teachers in this study did not regard discipline as the primary concern in the final interview is consistent with Odell's (1986) findings. In a study of 86 first-year and 79 "new to system" teachers in a single school district,

assistance with management was ranked fourth by first-year teachers and fifth by "new to system teachers."

Conclusion

In response to the goals set, the data of this study indicate that first-year teachers with mentors (Table 5) did decline in concern for "self" and "task" and increased in "impact" concerns over the 1986-87 school year. Thus it seems that these data are consistent with the Fuller Teacher Concerns Theory in explaining the development of first-year teachers with mentors. For first-year teachers without mentors, they, too, decreased in "self" concerns and increased in "impact" concerns over the course of the study. However, they remained at the same level for "task" concerns from the first to third interviews. Thus it also seems that the Fuller Teacher Concerns Theory does explain the development of first-year teachers without mentors but not as well as the development of first-year teachers with mentors.

The data of this study (Table 6) show that reentry teachers with mentors decreased only slightly in "self" concerns over the course of this study, remained at the same low level on "task" concerns, and expressed few "impact" concerns in the third interview. It would seem then that reentry teachers with mentors developed very limitedly in terms of the Fuller Theory. However, reentry teachers without mentors declined extensively in "self" concerns, showed some decline in "task" concerns, and considerable increase in "impact" concerns. Of all the groups in this study, reentry teachers without mentors made the greatest progress through the stages of the Fuller Concerns Theory.

Although two reentry teachers without mentors moved through the stages of the Fuller Teacher Concerns Theory, the data of this study, particularly the patterns of concern, indicate that teacher development for many first-year and reentry teachers may better be characterized as one of progression and retreat. Further research is required on this issue to determine to what extent this ebb

and flow in teacher development is dependent on the teacher, her/his working conditions, or other unidentified factors.

The third goal was to determine to what extent discipline was a concern for the first-year and reentry teachers of this study. The data of Table 8 indicate that all four groups of teachers--first-year with mentors, first-year without mentors, reentry with mentors, and reentry without mentors, declined in concern for discipline/classroom management. The results of this study indicate that, although all four groups of teachers identified some to considerable concern about discipline in the first interview, those concerns declined for all four groups of teachers during the year.

Consistent with previous studies (Veenman, 1984; Fuller, 1969), "discipline" was an important concern for first-year teachers with mentors throughout this school year. However, this is in sharp contrast to first-year and reentry teachers without mentors since discipline was of considerably less concern to them and apparently of no concern to reentry teachers with mentors. Is it possible that mentors, concerned about discipline, over-sensitized their mentees to that issue given the public's concern about discipline? (for example, see "The 21st Annual 1989 Gallup Poll of the Public's Attitudes Toward the Public Schools," Phi Delta Kappan, September 1989) The cause of this discrepancy needs further examination. In addition, research is needed to determine the extent to which the mentor teacher should work closely with the first-year or reentry teacher and when that support should be withdrawn. The results of this study suggest that that support might well be withdrawn earlier than had been thought.

Importance of the Study

Since induction programs for beginning and re-entry teachers, together with program evaluation data, are relatively new on the education scene,

What remains is the need for analytical research on teacher induction to direct our future program designs, and for outcome research to tell us how

better to induct teachers into the teacher profession." (Odell, 1987, p. 78)

This study is part of that effort, particularly on the issue of teacher development.

Further, this study reinforces the point that teaching is a very complex activity. Burke (1987) summarizes this complexity when he states

> The teacher is expected to be knowledgeable and skillful even though (i) students are diverse in capacity to learn; (ii) school systems are variable in programs and organization; (iii) societal characteristics often are unpredictable; (iv) governmental controls are inflexible; and (v) educational expectations of people often are unstable. . . . (p. vii; see also Feiman-Nemser and Buchmann, 1989; Feiman-Nemser and Floden, 1985 Fuller and Bown, 1975)

References

Borg, W. R. & Gall, M.D. (1983) Educational research: An introduction. 4th ed. New York: Longman.

Bullough, Jr., R.V. (1989) First-year teacher: A case study. New York: Teachers College Press.

Burke, P. J. (1987). Teacher development: Induction, renewal and redirection. New York: The Falmer Press.

Butler, D. and Smith, D. L. (March 1989). "A study of factors associated with fifth-year interns' concerns, problems, and stress." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA.

Cruickshank, D.R. and Callahan, R. (1983). "The other side of the desk: Stages and problems of teacher development," The Elementary School Journal, 83 (3), pp. 251-258.

Elam, S. M. and Gallup, A. M. (Sep. 1989). "The 21st annual Gallup Poll of the public's attitudes toward the public schools," Phi Delta Kappan, 71 (1), pp. 41-54.

Feiman-Nemser, S. & Buchmann, M. (Jan. 1989) "Describing teacher education: A framework and illustrative findings from a longitudinal study of six students," The Elementary School Journal, 89 (3), pp. 365-377.

Feiman-Nemser, S. & Floden, R.E. (1985). "The cultures of teaching," in Whitrock, M.C. (ed.). Handbook of Research on Teaching, pp. 505-525.

Fuller, F.F. (March 1969). "Concerns of teachers: A developmental conceptualization." American Educational Research Journal, 6, (2), 207-226.

Fuller, F.F. and Bown, O.H. (1975). "Becoming a teacher," in K. Ryan (ed.) Teacher education: The seventy-fourth yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part II, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 25-52.

George, A. A. (1978). Measuring self, task, and impact concerns: A manual for use of the Teacher Concerns Questionnaire, Austin, Texas: The University of Texas.

Hall, G. E. (1982). "Induction: The missing link," Journal of Teacher Education, 33 (3), 53-55.

Moffett, K.L., St. John, J. & Isken, J. (1987). "Training and coaching beginning teachers: An antidote to reality shock." Educational Leadership, 34-36.

Odell, S. J. (Jan-Feb 1986). "Induction support of new teachers: A functional approach," Journal of Teacher Education, 37 (1), 26-29.

Odell, S.J. (1987). "Teacher induction: Rationale and issues," in D. M. Brooks, (ed). Teacher induction: A new beginning. Reston, Virginia: Association of Teacher Educators, 69-80.

Ryan, K. (1986). The induction of new teachers. Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation.

Veenman, S. (1984). "Perceived problems of beginning teachers." Review of Educational Research, 54 (1), 143-178.

Table 1. Distribution of teachers by teaching level/assignment and gender

	Teachers With Mentors										Teachers Without Mentors									
	1st Year				Re-entry						1st Year				Re-entry					
	Male		Female		Male		Female		Total		Male		Female		Male		Female		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Elem.	1	5%	2	10%	1	5%	2	10%	6	30%	1	5%	3	16%	0	0%	2	11%	6	32%
Middle/ Jr. Hi.	1	5%	3	15%	0	0%	1	5%	5	25%	0	0%	2	11%	1	5%	0	0%	3	16%
Elem. & Middle	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	5%	0	0%	0	0%	1	5%
Sr. Hi	1	5%	2	10%	0	0%	1	5%	4	20%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	5%	1	5%
Spec. Ed.	0	0%	4	20%	0	0%	1	5%	5	25%	0	0%	1	5%	1	5%	6	32%	8	42%
Total	3		11		1		5		20	100%	1		7		2		9		19	100%

Table 2. Concerns expressed in first interview

	Teachers With Mentors 1st Year		Teachers With Mentors Reentry		Teachers W/O Mentors 1st Year		Teachers W/O Mentors Reentry	
Response	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Self	7	50%	4	67%	4	50%	5	45%
Task	6	43%	1	17%	4	50%	4	36%
Impact	1	7%	0	0%	0	0%	2	18%
No Response	0	0%	1	17%	0	0%	0	0%
Totals	14	100%	6	101%*	8	100%	11	100%

* more than 100% due to rounding

Table 3. Concerns expressed in second interview

	Teachers With Mentors				Teachers W/O Mentors			
	1st Year		Reentry		1st Year		Reentry	
Response	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Self	6	43%	3	50%	0	0%	2	18%
Task	5	36%	1	17%	5	63%	6	55%
Impact	3	21%	2	33%	3	38%	3	27%
Totals	14	100%	6	100%	8	101%*	11	100%

* more than 100% due to rounding

Table 4. Concerns expressed in third interview

	Teachers With Mentors				Teachers W/O Mentors			
	1st Year		Reentry		1st Year		Reentry	
Response	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Self	5	36%	3	50%	2	25%	2	18%
Task	4	29%	1	17%	4	50%	3	27%
Impact	4	29%	1	17%	2	25%	6	55%
No Response	1	7%	1	17%	0	0%	0	0%
Totals	14	101%*	6	101%*	8	100%	11	100%

* more than 100% due to rounding

Table 5. Concerns expressed in three interviews by first-year teachers with and without mentors

	1st-Year/With Mentors						1st-Year/Without Mentors					
Interview >	#1		#2		#3		#1		#2		#3	
Response	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Self	7	50%	6	43%	5	36%	4	50%	0	0%	2	25%
Task	6	43%	5	36%	4	29%	4	50%	5	63%	4	50%
Impact	1	7%	3	21%	4	29%	0	0%	3	38%	2	25%
No Response	0	0%	0	0%	1	7%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Totals	14	100%	14	100%	14	100%	8	100%	8	101%*	8	100%

* more than 100% due to rounding

Table 6. Concerns expressed in three interviews by reentry teachers with and without mentors

	Reentry/With Mentors						Reentry/Without Mentors					
Interview >	#1		#2		#3		#1		#2		#3	
Response	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Self	4	67%	3	50%	3	50%	5	45%	2	18%	2	18%
Task	1	17%	1	17%	1	17%	4	36%	6	55%	3	27%
Impact	0	0%	2	33%	1	17%	2	18%	3	27%	6	55%
No Response	1	17%	0	0%	1	17%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Totals	6	101%*	6	100%	6	101%*	11	100%	11	100%	11	100%

* more than 100% due to rounding

Table 7. Concern patterns over three interviews for first-year and reentry teachers with and without mentors

Concern-Interview #1	#2	#3	Teachers With Mentors: 1st-Year N	%	Reentry N	%	Total N	%	Teachers W/O Mentors: 1st-Year N	%	Reentry N	%	Total N	%
A. Concern Patterns for Teachers With 1st-Interview "Self" Concerns														
S	S	S	3	21%	3	50%	6	71%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
S	S	I	1	7%	0	0%	1	7%	0	0%	1	9%	1	9%
S	T	S	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	9%	1	9%
S	T	T	1	7%	1	17%	2	24%	2	25%	0	0%	2	25%
S	T	I	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	18%	2	18%
S	I	S	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	25%	0	0%	2	25%
S	I	T	1	7%	0	0%	1	7%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
S	I	I	1	7%	0	0%	1	7%	0	0%	1	9%	1	9%
B. Concern Patterns for Teachers With 1st-Interview "Task" Concerns														
T	T	T	1	7%	0	0%	1	7%	2	25%	2	18%	4	43%
T	T	S	1	7%	0	0%	1	7%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
T	T	I	1	7%	0	0%	1	7%	1	13%	0	0%	1	13%
T	S	S	1	7%	0	0%	1	7%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
T	S	T	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	9%	1	9%
T	S	?	1	7%	0	0%	1	7%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
T	I	T	1	7%	0	0%	1	7%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
T	I	I	0	0%	1	17%	1	7%	1	13%	1	9%	2	22%
C. Concern Patterns for Teachers With 1st-Interview "Impact" Concerns														
I	I	S	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	9%	1	9%
I	T	I	1	7%	0	0%	1	7%	0	0%	1	9%	1	9%
?	I	?	0	0%	1	17%	1	17%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
			14	98%*	6	101%*			8	101%*	11	99%*		

* more or less than 100% due to rounding

S = self concerns; T = task concerns; I = impact concerns

Table 8. Concern about discipline expressed in three interviews by first-year and reentry teachers

	1st Year Teachers				Reentry Teachers			
	Mentors		No Mentors		Mentors		No Mentors	
Interview #	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1st Interview	6	43%	3	38%	3	60%	2	18%
2nd Interview	4	29%	0	0%	1	17%	0	0%
3rd Interview	3	23%	1	13%	0	0%	1	9%